

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 466

EA 020 243

TITLE Talking with Educators. The Results of a Series of Conferences Designed To Give Voice to the Views of Outstanding North Carolina Educators.

INSTITUTION Public School Forum of North Carolina, Raleigh.

PUB DATE [88]

NOTE 34p.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Collegiality; *Educational Change; Educational Facilities Improvement; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *School Based Management

IDENTIFIERS *North Carolina

ABSTRACT

Over 300 North Carolina educators, administrators, and policy makers were brought together in a series of six conferences to express their views about what can be done to improve their state's schools. Two questions were discussed: (1) In the eyes of outstanding educators, what changes at the school building level would make the greatest improvement in student learning?; and (2) what changes would make schools a better place in which to work? The findings of these conversations, reported in this document, focus around six emerging issues: principals and teachers need more control over site issues including budgets and resources; planning time is needed for faculties to work together; class sizes should be reduced; more clerical assistance and support staff should be available; building facilities should be improved; and noninstructional duties should be eliminated for professional staff. Implications from this collaborative discussion are summarized. Appended are comments by some participants, listings of the participants, detailed data from each of the meetings, and an agenda. (LMS)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 297 466

Talking With Educators



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
DERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John N.
Dorman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 020 243

The results of a
series of conferences
designed to give voice
to the views of
oustanding North
Carolina educators.

Introduction

For too long, the debate about school reform had raged in governmental, business and media circles. Seldom were educators asked to voice their opinions about school reform. Then the Education Commission of the States (ECS) had a revolutionary idea: bring the nation's outstanding teachers together with policy makers and ask them what they thought should be done to improve the country's schools.

That idea led to a number of the nation's governors hosting a series of policy discussions that brought teachers together with legislators, congressmen and governors. The outcome of those meetings, not surprisingly, was a renewed appreciation on the part of policy makers for the problems and aspirations of teachers. Teachers, in turn, left the meetings feeling that the views of the people who must implement any meaningful reforms were being sought by those who make policy.

Pam Brewer, North Carolina's 1986-87 Teacher of the Year from Roxboro, represented her colleagues at the Washington D.C. meeting that culminated the ECS-initiated policy discussions. She came back to North Carolina determined to see similar discussions in her own state.

After approaching a variety of groups, including education associations, state agencies, federal research centers and others, Mrs. Brewer found two North Carolina-based groups that were willing to plan and sponsor what became the nation's most ambitious series of "Talking With Educators" conferences.

The two groups, the North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and the Public School Forum, elected to expand the scope of the discussions to include principals and superintendents as well as teachers, school board members, county commissioners, members of the State Board of Education and legislators.

The result was a series of six conferences that brought over 300 policy makers and educators together to focus on two questions:

In the eyes of outstanding educators, what changes at the school building level would make the greatest improvement in student learning?

What changes would make schools a better place in which to work?

Predictably, the answers to those questions varied at each of the six conference sites, but by the time the series was concluded, there was a strong degree of consensus on major changes needed.

The following pages describe the outcome of the "Talking With Educators" conferences in more detail. Hopefully, the recommendations contained within this document will not go unheeded by educators and policy makers attempting to make meaningful improvements in schools.



Dr. Bruce McPherson, Executive Director, N.C. Center for the Advancement of Teaching; Pam Brewer, 1985-86 N.C. Teacher of the Year; and John Dornan, President and Executive Director, Public School Forum.

Executive Summary

Each of the six "Talking With Educators" conferences focused on two groups of issues. The first group of issues was labeled "traditional" because many of them—more clerical assistance, reduction of paperwork and the like—have been discussed for years. The second group of issues was termed "emerging" because they have come under scrutiny only recently as a result of the national debate about school reform. Each of the six conferences began by focusing on 16 issues; each conference quickly added additional issues to the list.

Following are the central issues isolated by over 300 outstanding teachers, principals and superintendents in response to the questions:

"What changes at the school building level would make the greatest improvement for student learning and what changes would make the school a better place in which to work?"



Brian Tarr, Teacher, Charlotte/Mecklenburg Public Schools; State Sen. Robert Warren; and Tanya Brumfield, Teacher, Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools.

The Most Important Emerging Issues:

- 1) Principals and teachers should have more decision making and control over issues impacting the school building and school day.
- 2) Planning time is needed during which faculties can work together.
- 3) Teachers and principals must have more decision-making latitude over school budgets and resources.
- 4) School management should be more collegial (i.e. more collaborative).

While these items may seem very clear cut, the debate that led to these eight items was anything but simple. The following pages will explain each of the items in more depth. Also, other items that emerged at one or more of the meetings will be discussed.

It should be noted that each of the conferences had one "ground rule." The conference planners took for granted that issues such as salary increases and retirement benefits were important but asked educators and policy makers at each meeting to focus only on changes that could be made at the school building level. The omission of such items should not be interpreted to mean that they were not important to the participants.

The Most Important Traditional Issues:

- 1) Class sizes should be reduced.
- 2) More clerical assistance and support staff should be available to support faculties.
- 3) General building facilities should be improved.
- 4) Non-instructional duties should be eliminated or assigned to non-professional staff.

The Participants

In too many instances, policy makers discount recommendations from educators because officials formally speaking for groups of educators are often seen as representing a "special interest" point of view. The conference planners took great pains to assemble a diverse group of educators who would not be subject to that charge. Attending the conferences were:

- 37 local school system teachers of the year from rural and urban, large and small districts across the state;
- 10 award-winning school principals recognized by First Wachovia Bank or in state or national competition;
- 126 alumni of the North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching nominated by the center's staff;
- 26 alumni of the North Carolina Principals Executive Program nominated by the program's staff;
- 23 local school superintendents recognized for their school leadership or innovations within their school systems;
- 12 members of the North Carolina Association of Educators' Instructional and Professional Development Committee;
- 12 principals nominated by the NCAE's Principals Division; and
- 12 principals nominated by the North Carolina Association of School Administrators.

All told, 243 outstanding North Carolina educators gathered at the six conference sites to focus on meaningful school improvement. Coming to listen to the educators' recommendations were a total of 77 policy makers including:

- 14 members of the North Carolina Senate;
- 31 members of the North Carolina House of Representatives;
- 4 candidates for statewide office;
- 9 local school board members nominated by the North Carolina School Board Association;
- 12 local county commissioners nominated by the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners;
- 3 members of the State Board of Education; and
- 8 members of the Governor's staff, the General Assembly Fiscal Research staff, the State Department of Public Instruction, the Association of School Administrators and the ECS.

A complete list of participants is included in Appendix A.

The Format

Each educator and policy maker who attended one of the six "Talking With Educators" conferences received pre-registration material that included a copy of a recent study of the school environment. That study, "The Condition of Being an Educator," was conducted jointly by the Public School Forum and five large businesses: IBM, Carolina Power & Light, Duke Power, Champion Paper and Burlington Industries.

The study looked at issues as diverse as personnel policies, technology, support resources, managerial and organizational systems, and the use of time during the school day. The study pinpointed a number of areas of need within the school's work setting.

Participants were not asked to validate or refute the findings of the study; rather, they were asked to focus on the school environment and on issues that could be improved. "The Condition of Being an Educator" study was used as a catalyst for discussion. At each conference:

- Participants convened with a reception and dinner followed by an examination of the "Condition" study and an overview of the structure of the next day's policy discussion.
- The next morning, the conferences began with a mixed group of educators (i.e., teachers, principals and superintendents) spending the first session in a wide-ranging discussion of problems within the school setting. While much of the discussion focused on a "ballot" used for straw polls throughout the day, participants were free to identify issues they felt should be added to the ballot as the day progressed. At the conclusion, participants ranked, by secret ballot, the items they felt were most important.

- After the results of that session were tabulated, participants met in small groups by job category (i.e., teachers met in one group, principals in another, etc.). During this session, participants discussed the results of the first straw vote and decided whether they agreed or disagreed with new items that had emerged during the first session. This session also concluded with a straw poll.
- As the participants broke for lunch, the results of the second session were tabulated and, following lunch, participants reconvened in their original mixed groups and were given an hour and one-half to reach consensus on the changes they viewed as most important to the school environment.

- When the final votes were tabulated, policy makers—who had spent the day listening to educators—had an opportunity to join the table discussions, ask questions, seek clarifications and elicit more information.
- The day concluded with a panel of policy makers reacting to what they had heard and with a panel of educators reacting to the outcome of the discussion.

The Straw Polling Process

Because the goal of each conference was to arrive at a consensus on critical needs at the school level, a straw poll process was used throughout the day to force participants to seek consensus on issues and to provide an incentive to the groups to discard items of less importance and focus on meaningful school improvements.

By using a computerized tabulation program, the participants received instant feedback not only about the views of others in their group, but also of the total group.

While the items on the ballot framed the initial deliberations, new items emerged as each conference progressed. In several cases, those new items gained momentum and were among the top five before the day ended. The ballot that each group used as a starting point for the deliberation is printed below:

TALKS WITH EDUCATORS Mixed Group Discussion

Select the items you deem most appropriate for improving working conditions at the local school level by ranking each item (1) in the traditional issues category and (2) in the emergent issues category. Each category is to be ranked separately according to the number of items that appear. If items you think are very important are not listed in one or both of these categories, write them in after "other" in the appropriate category and rank them among your total number of items in that category. Use the largest number you have in each category to rank your highest priority in that category and the number 1 to rank your lowest priority in each category.

PERMANENT ISSUE:

increase salaries
(will not be discussed
at this meeting)

TRADITIONAL ISSUES:

1. ☐ smaller class size
2. ☐ improve local staff development programs
3. ☐ more equipment for faculty use
4. ☐ more clerical assistance for teachers
5. ☐ fewer non-instructional duties (i.e., hall/bus duty)
6. ☐ less paperwork
7. ☐ professional supervision and evaluation of classroom teachers
8. ☐ improve general building facilities at the local level
9. ☐ other (specify)
10. ☐ other (specify)

EMERGENT ISSUES:

1. ☐ office space for teachers
2. ☐ more training for teachers in use of technology
3. ☐ planning period for every teacher
4. ☐ differentiate roles for teachers (i.e., "lead teacher")
5. ☐ telephone for private use of teachers/staff
6. ☐ more budget decision-making opportunities at the school level
7. ☐ improve collegiality among teachers and administrators in order to facilitate collaborative efforts
8. ☐ clarify accountability of teachers/administrators
9. ☐ technical management/information systems for local schools
10. ☐ provide more decision-making and control for teachers and principals at the building level
11. ☐ other (specify)
12. ☐ other (specify)

The Findings

What finally emerged as the primary concerns of educators from across North Carolina was surprising in at least two regards: in the area of "emerging issues," each of the meetings began and ended with the equivalent of a primal scream that, boiled down, said, "If policy makers would tell us what they wanted out of schools and let us decide how to do it at the building level, we would succeed and we would be held accountable." That concern was voiced by teachers, principals and superintendents who were almost unanimous in their desire to have more authority and control over local decision making.

The other surprise was the degree of unanimity that emerged out of the conferences. Whether the participants were meeting in mixed groups or in separate groups by job category, the concerns about the schools were almost identical. In like fashion, whether the participants were from the mountains, the urban Piedmont or the rural East, the concerns were almost identical.

The following pages will analyze in far more detail the issues that surfaced as priorities to educators in North Carolina:

EMERGING ISSUES

- 1) Principals and teachers should have more decision making and control over issues impacting the school building and school day.
- 2) Planning time is needed during which faculties can work together.
- 3) Teachers and principals must have more decision-making latitude over school budgets and resources.
- 4) School management should be more collegial (i.e., more collaborative).

When one looks at the four issues which emerged as the major recommendations in the emerging issues category, there is a remarkable similarity to what America's corporate community is now attempting to do within restructured organizations:

Managers are finding that decisions that come "top-down" (i.e., from management to employees) frequently are not as productive as those that are made closest to the production line or to the client—in school terms, closest to the student. Further, in work settings where managers and employees work collaboratively on solving problems and where they are given time to focus on the problems, the solutions often lead to major advances in productivity.

In the simplest terms, the "emerging issues" recommendations are inter-related: In their eyes, teachers and principals should work more as a team; they should be given far greater control over decisions impacting schools; and they should be given the time to work and plan together.

Accountability and Decision Making

Principals and teachers said over and over that they did not fear accountability if they had more control over their work environment.

A superintendent from the Asheville area summed it up best when he said: "The school level is the ideal place to give autonomy; let educators decide what is in the best interest of students and be held accountable for the results."

The word "accountability," however, sparked intense debates among participants. One Charlotte teacher said: "... there is not clarity about what we actually are accountable for." That sentiment was echoed at all of the meetings.

There was also disagreement about how many educators actually want to be given power and control. A principal from Mecklenburg County contended that "... many teachers do not want the accountability or the responsibility that go with control."

That sentiment, however, was not pervasive, and the consensus among the six meetings seemed to be summed up by a teacher at the Greensboro conference who said: "It's a dignity issue. I want to be treated like a college graduate who, given responsibility, will respond by accepting accountability."

Missing, however, is clarity around what accountability means. The fifth issue of importance in the emerging issues area of the discussions was a recommendation that accountability needs to be clarified by policy makers; specifically, educators need to know exactly what is expected of the schools.

Collaborative Management

There was little disagreement about the need for teachers and principals to work closer together at the building level. A school principal from Greenville put it this way: "In school, it is we/thee; I need teachers as much as they need me."

A school administrator at the Asheville conference speculated that "lack of autonomy and collaboration are the reasons many of our teachers are leaving the classroom." A teacher from the Greenville area underlined that sentiment when she said: "Teachers have a powerless feeling because in our large system everything is mandated and nothing is negotiable. We feel out of control even in our classrooms. Certainly the school has lost control."

Decision Making and School Funding

The feelings of powerlessness expressed by teachers were expressed more vehemently by many school principals. One Greensboro participant put it this way: "Principals are as much in the dark about how much money there is in the budget as anyone; we simply wait to be told how much our building will have for the next year and hope for the best."

Part of the problem appears to be the way in which decisions are made at the local school system level, and part of the problem appears to be the way in which money flows from the state.

Frequently, school administrators contended that "their hands were tied" due to rigid funding formulas in the State Department of Public Instruction. "We need fewer rules about how we are to spend money and more flexibility to respond to our local needs," said one.

At the local level, some felt that discretionary money flowed unequally to the schools depending on local politics and the relationships of principals to front office administrators.

"Many of our needs could be met," contended a Wilmington principal, "if funding was decentralized and decisions over priorities could be made at the building level."

If there was one point which virtually all agreed to, it was that decision-making power and more decentralized control wouldn't cost a nickel. As one principal put it: "If policy makers would experiment with letting schools make more decisions, we might all find that we could do more with the amount of money that is there. Our problem now is that we don't have any discretion."

Decision Making and Professionalism

The lack of discretion, feelings of powerlessness, too little control over building decisions, and confusion about accountability all contributed to a general concern about professionalism, or the lack of it, in education.

At each of the six conferences, table discussions which began on decision making ended up focusing on the issue of professionalism. As one teacher in Greenville said: "If teachers aren't decision makers, how can we teach the children to be decision makers?"

A principal said: "All of this is tied to releasing the classroom teacher to do what he/she is hired to do. I must trust the teacher to do what he/she is able and trained to do."

A Charlotte teacher put the discussion in context when he said, "I am responsible for 150 students a day; I work on staff and curriculum development programs and I am active in professional association activities, yet I need to practically ask permission to go to the bathroom."

While venting frustrations, the participants typically turned quickly to solutions. A Greensboro area administrator said: "We should be working together to develop a shared vision of what our schools should be."

A school board member who said, "We are all in this together; it has to be a 'we' not 'they' situation," mirrored the thoughts of an Asheville teacher who said, "It's clear we all have the same concerns—kids."

While the discussions led to a strong consensus that building-level educators, teachers and principals needed to be given far greater latitude and control over decision making, it became very clear that the lack of time for planning and meeting was a major obstacle.

Decision Making and Time

When considering the implications of having more of a voice in decision making, an Asheville-area teacher said: "Being given the power to make decisions means little if there is no time in which to make them."

A Charlotte-area superintendent said: "Teachers and principals need time between and among each other to get to know each other as people as well as professionals before they can be expected to function well in a decision-making setting."

The chief culprits identified as the reasons there is too little time are not surprising. Teachers cited paperwork, lack of clerical help, non-instructional duties, and no scheduled planning time during the day. Principals, on the other hand, cited the new time demands from the statewide evaluation process, monitoring duties and the lack of administrative support. "How can I be an instructional leader when I am worried about school bathrooms being torn apart," said one administrator from the Boone area.

As educators examined the time constraints, a long list of facility and resource-related needs emerged: more phones, updated duplicating equipment, hourly aides for monitoring duties and more clerical support (see "Traditional Issues" section).

Additional Time May Be Needed

At several conferences, another option surfaced. That option was looking at extended work days or a longer work year. The option, however, evoked mixed responses. At Charlotte, Asheville and Boone, one or more discussion groups focused on the potential for a longer day or a longer school year. Advantages cited were: being able to put in quality time on planning and staff development, the potential of moving closer to a professional salary and being able to move into the kind of planning areas that too frequently are sacrificed because of time constraints.

Opposition to the idea revolved around the question of choice for those not wanting a longer day or year and inadequate facilities. "It won't help to have a twelve-month year if our buildings are not air conditioned in the summer," said a teacher from the Wilmington area.

There appeared to be consensus, however, that voluntarily extending the school year for some could prove to be a boon for planning at the building level.

A Final Word on Emerging Issues

The four items that were ranked the highest at all of the six conferences (i.e., more control over decision making and budget decisions at the building level; more time for planning and more collegial or collaborative working relationships between principals and teachers) prevailed over some items, such as office space and more technology in schools, for a simple reason:

The superintendents, principals and teachers considering the needs of schools realized that if educators were given the latitude to make decisions that would improve instruction and make schools a better place in which to work, those more tangible issues could be resolved. In short, they believed that if professionals were given the latitude and the time to make good decisions about schools, they would resolve the issues so frequently cited as major problems.

In isolation, that might be a somewhat surprising conclusion; but for anyone studying the revolution underway in business management, it could well have been a predictable conclusion. Many of the complaints so adamantly voiced by working people often focus on the symbolic when there appears to be no alternative to the structure in which they work.

Office space and phones are important symbolic issues because they seem to send a message that educators are denied true professional status.

The underlying issue is professional status, and office space cannot replace the lack of professional worth that comes from being denied the right to make decisions over issues in which one has been trained.

The 243 superintendents, principals and teachers who wrestled with emerging issues separated symbolism from substance and concluded that the bottom line was for educators to be given a clear set of expectations and the authority and time in which to structure a work setting that would meet those expectations.

TRADITIONAL ISSUES

As mentioned earlier, traditional issues were defined as issues that have been under debate for decades—lower class sizes, more clerical assistance, improved staff development, less paperwork and so on. In some cases it was difficult to make a distinction between “emerging” and “traditional” issues because the length of time an issue has been under discussion in no way lessens the importance of the issue.

In fact, as one principal from the Charlotte area said, “Until we can solve the traditional issues, we will never tackle the emerging issues.” While that seems in conflict with the types of issues that rose to the top as educators debated emerging issues, it underscores again a basic fact of life for school reformers.

Education reform is not a matter of dealing with a series of isolated issues; true reform will require seeing old and new issues as a package and working on a variety of issues at the same time.

What follows is an examination of the traditional issues which were ranked most important by participants at the “Talking With Educator” conferences. Those issues were:

- 1) Class sizes should be reduced.
- 2) More clerical assistance and support staff should be available to support teachers and principals.
- 3) General building facilities should be improved.
- 4) Non-instructional duties should be eliminated or assigned to non-professional staff.

As with the emerging issues, none of the issues were clear cut and each was debated with vigor; however, none received more discussion than did class size.

Class Size . . . The Most Traditional Issue

Every time one study points to lowered class size as the answer to better education, another study reaches the opposite conclusion. While academics debate the point, however, surveys of teachers invariably find lowered class size either first or second on the list of things that could make a dramatic difference in education.

While the “Talking With Educators” conferences reached that conclusion, it is worth noting that at several of the group discussions in different locations, there was intense discussion about class size in the context of a differently structured school setting. The debate typically focused on whether class size would be as important as it currently is if

teachers were given ample clerical and technical support. Frequently, teachers and principals would agree that in a school that had aides to relieve monitoring duties and clerical staff to support paperwork chores, class size would be less of an issue.

In the current context of schools, however, there was little disagreement about class size as a major priority for change. One high school teacher captured the sentiment of the group best when he said, “As it is, with 29 to 32 students in each class, I don’t give up, but I do give out.”

It became clear as the six conferences moved across the state, that state guidelines on class size are routinely only a paper guideline, not a reality. Very few elementary teachers had class sizes of 26 or fewer; for high school teachers, the issues were how many classes and what number of students were taught per day.



Jeri Fitzgerald, Staff Member, N.C. Center for the Advancement of Teaching.



Twists on the Class Size Issue

At three of six meetings, participants shifted from the class size issue to a less common problem—combination classrooms. Combination classes typically exist in small, rural schools where there are not enough students to support a stand-alone grade level, so students from two grades (e.g., second and third or fifth and sixth) are assigned to the same teacher.

One teacher from a small, low-wealth school system in the Wilmington area said, "I have a fifth grade son who has been in a combination class every year except one. My daughter is in a seventh-eighth grade combination class this year. One-half of her social studies class is spent on seventh grade World Cultures, the other half on eighth grade North Carolina history."

In two conferences, the abolition of combination classes became a major issue.

That led to a heated discussion about the size of schools. In two of the six conferences, groups of educators debated at length the traditional wisdom that "bigger schools are better schools." While larger schools usually are not confronted with problems like combination classes, size itself can present other problems.

One superintendent from an eastern county said, "We need to rethink individual school sizes in order to restore interpersonal relations and community and family participation. I've been in education long enough to see everything come and go and come again, but I do not believe that big is necessarily better."

The class size issue is a complicated issue, but one thing was clear: if schools are structured as they are today and if teachers have no additional clerical or support assistance, class size is, without a close second, the major issue for North Carolina educators.

Clerical Assistance and Non-Instructional Duties

Two of the traditional issues are virtually interchangeable—additional clerical assistance and relief from non-instructional duties. They also cover a myriad of issues raised by both principals and teachers. As examples:

- A teacher in the Boone area said: "I'm a teacher, not a secretary; but on some days, it is hard to tell the difference."
- A principal at the Wilmington conference said: "We're being strangled by administrivia."

- A teacher in Greensboro said: "Every other profession hires people to run off copies and collate paper; why can't we?"
- A former state teacher of the year said: "After 15 years of teaching, I still spend 49 minutes a day walking up and down halls doing hall duty."

As educators worked beyond their feelings about the issues, one thing became clear:

Clerical assistance alone is not the problem. The problem is both clerical assistance and monitoring relief. For principals, time spent watching buses load and unload and patrolling the cafeteria and halls are enormous time consumers. For teachers, lunch duty, hall duty, home room paperwork and the like are equally time consuming.

Teaching Assistants

As educators talked through the problem of non-instructional duties, many alternatives were considered, ranging from volunteer parents to more teaching assistants.

Volunteer help was rejected because too many schools have had negative experiences with parent volunteers who could not be relied on to work each day or who made commitments they would not honor.

When suggestions were made to increase the number of instructional assistants, elementary teachers raised legitimate concerns. Lower-grade elementary teachers who have full-time aides said that too many were of marginal help from an instructional point of view because of a lack of training and skills.

A Charlotte teacher said: "We need to be better managers of assistants—more importantly, we should have assistants do clerical work, hall duty and lunch duty, and free us to do the instructional job."

Other educators advocated more technology as the answer, but educators from buildings that have computers available for faculty members and who are using the Student Information Management System (SIMS) said, "The answer is not just more equipment; it is equipment and someone to use it." Educator after educator pointed out what business people are finding as technology comes into the work site: technology requires data entry personnel and people trained to use the equipment. Without people trained and available to operate the new technology, its time saving benefits will not be realized.

An Aside on Paperwork

The conference planners were somewhat surprised that eliminating paperwork did not emerge as a higher priority item. What emerged instead was a concern that required paperwork be of value.

For instance, a superintendent from the Wilmington area said: "We can add more clerical help, but until paperwork demands stop coming from above, the problem will never be solved." A Greenville teacher added: "I don't mind doing paperwork if it is being used; so often it is only filed or put on a shelf."

More serious than required educational paperwork was record keeping not related to instruction. A teacher from Eastern North Carolina said: "I have an unbelievable amount of non-instructional work required as a result of clubs, class sponsorships and so on; it has reached the point that, on some days, teaching becomes secondary."

Another teacher added: "We are always going to have to spend time on paperwork, but it should be on significant issues, such as budgets or instructional decisions, rather than non-instructional duties, such as collecting money and keeping track of lunches."

At all six meetings, the problem that surfaced was not as simple as too much paperwork and record-keeping; it was the myriad of non-instructional duties routinely assigned to teachers and principals.



George Graham, Lenoir County Commissioner.

The Need for Better Facilities

While teachers from wealthy county school systems often reported having pleasant work surroundings and adequate space, teachers from smaller and less wealthy schools from one end of the state to the other shared "horror stories" about school facilities.

When a teacher at the Greensboro area conference said, "I don't care how many kids are in my classroom, I just wish they would fix the ceiling so it would stop raining on the ones I have," some people thought she was exaggerating. Only two weeks later at the Greenville area conference, another teacher who had been sitting quietly through a discussion of traditional issues erupted when a suggestion was made to drop the building facility issue. She literally shouted, "Don't take that out; it rains in my classroom."

An experienced Eastern North Carolina teacher shared a story that was all too familiar to participants in his group. Because of space limitations, a school system was forced to move ninth graders to a high school, but no new facilities were added to the building. Eight teachers who formerly had their own classroom now push carts with their books and teaching material from room to room; there are too few bathrooms, and what little conference space that existed is gone.

From across the state there were anecdotes about teachers moving around to three and four classrooms a day, using mobile classroom facilities and sharing terribly overcrowded work rooms where time is wasted each day standing in line to use one over-taxed copying machine.

A Greenville area principal described music classes being taught in the auditorium while speech classes are taught in the auditorium dressing room.

The strong feelings about facilities were perhaps best captured by a Charlotte area teacher who described the condition of a 19-year-old carpet that was to be replaced in her classroom; however, the maintenance tractor broke down and had to be replaced. The teacher said, "For the last two years, whenever the tractor drives by, I wave and think, 'There goes our carpet.' "

The General Assembly last year took an unprecedented step and voted to give direct aid to school systems for improving and adding school facilities. After listening to stories like those above, the support cannot come too soon.

The issue of building facilities goes far beyond inconvenience for teachers. As a superintendent of one of the poorest county school systems in the state said, "We've got children coming from some of the poorest homes in North Carolina; we owe it to them to let them spend time in clean, decent surroundings when they are in school."

A principal from the Greenville area added that her school has some of the highest test scores in the county even though her children are among the lowest economic group. She attributes part of their motivation to the fact that they have a new and attractive building in which to work, and she contends it makes a difference in how teachers and students approach their work.

Other Issues That Emerged

While this report has focused primarily on the eight issues that surfaced as the most important recommendations from the educators attending the sessions, other issues emerged at one or another of the conferences and some of them gained top ranking status before the conference(s) concluded. Included among them were:

- Creating a more professional system of employee evaluation that focuses on developing good teaching;
- Differentiating roles for educators by function, not simply by pay scales;
- Making better use of modern technology in schools;
- Providing computer training for teachers and principals;
- Streamlining paperwork for exceptional children;
- Reducing the fragmentation of the school day, especially by reducing the number of times that students are pulled out of regular classes for special programs;
- Expanding the range of alternatives for dealing with discipline problems and the changing family structure;
- Attempting to increase parental support for schools;
- Increasing professional development funding;
- Reconsidering the use of tests and testing in schools; and
- Making the process for selecting principals and assistant principals more collegial.

Summary

Some 243 educators discussed their concerns at six one and one-half day conferences. Not surprisingly, it is impossible to adequately document all of the recommendations and problems that surfaced.

The four emerging issues and the four traditional issues that were the consensus of the six meetings, however, capture the essence of the "Talking With Educators" conferences.

Simply stated, North Carolina's outstanding educators believe:

- teachers and principals should have more latitude to make decisions impacting the delivery of instruction and the structure of schools;
- more time is necessary for delivering instruction and for planning; eliminating non-instructional duties through additional clerical and teacher assistant support positions would free up time for both;
- quality instruction can be improved through making class sizes smaller and through providing better school facilities; and
- many of these problems could be solved if teachers and principals worked collaboratively and were given more latitude over budgets, personnel issues and educational decision making.

Implications

Many of the recommendations coming from the state's outstanding educators are notable in that they do not require an outlay of massive amounts of money, nor do they lend themselves to legislative solutions. Working collaboratively, for instance, requires a change of attitude, a change of managerial philosophy.

Allowing principals and teachers to have more control over decision making and budgetary matters requires a "leap of faith," a giving up of control.

Several other key recommendations relate to initiatives contained in the Basic Education Program and the new school construction plan; positive improvements in those areas should occur as the impact of both programs is felt at the local level.

The following sections attempt to look at the implications of the "Talking With Educators" conferences from the vantage point of members of the General Assembly, members of the State Board of Education, county commissioners, local school board members, local school administrators and teachers.

Implications for the General Assembly

The costliest priority recommendations coming out of the conferences are already being



Everlena Diggs, Teacher, Greensboro City Schools; and Dr. Larry Coble, Superintendent, Durham County Schools.

addressed in one form or another by the Basic Education Program (BEP). Included in the BEP are provisions that will result in lowered class sizes, more clerical assistance, and more teacher assistants. As a result of the school construction initiative, counties should be able to accelerate the pace of new school building and improvement programs.

While all of these initiatives should make tangible improvements in schools across the state, major problems remain. While more clerical assistance and teacher aides are earmarked for school buildings, the new personnel will do little more than sustain the status quo as a result of the 13,000 new professional positions being funded by the BEP.

The net effect will be that teachers and principals will continue to spend literally millions of hours annually on non-instructional jobs like hall monitoring, bus and lunch duty, and clerical work. Those millions of hours could be devoted to working with children or to planning better instructional programs.

Time spent on non-instructional duties appears to be the major obstacle to overcoming many of the educational problems confronting the state. It would be productive to reassess the allocations for clerical employees and teacher assistants contained in the Basic Education Program and seek ways to improve the ratio of clerical employees to professional employees and to broaden the availability of teacher aides beyond the primary grades.

Further, a frequent complaint voiced at the six conferences was the number of new program demands from the General Assembly or the State Board of Education that were not accompanied by additional resources. Another was the number of new initiatives that bring additional reporting requirements and further restrict the use of school time. These concerns can be boiled down to three basic questions:

- Is the time ripe for a reassessment of the requirements currently placed on schools?
- Is it riper yet for a movement toward educational de-regulation with a far more precise clarification of what is expected of local school systems?
- Should the General Assembly reassess the support staffing plans contained in the BEP to determine whether the levels of support staff are adequate?

Implications for the State Board of Education

Much of the rigidity that prevents principals and teachers from using their resources differently in an attempt to meet the unique needs of their schools emanates not from the General Assembly but from the rules and regulations of the State Board of Education, the State Department of Public Instruction and the Controllers' Office. We must ask ourselves:

- Is this an opportune time to reassess the rules and regulations governing resources to identify ways to provide more local flexibility?
- With that, should the State Board of Education clarify its expectations of schools and seek ways to encourage innovation and creativity at the local level by providing more flexibility?
- Finally, could the State Board of Education initiate research and training aimed at encouraging a more collaborative style of school management at the building level?

Implications for County Commissioners and School Board Members

Decisions regarding building facilities are very much a shared responsibility of county commissioners and school board members.

- Could county commissioners and school board members take a more aggressive posture and build greater local support for replacing inadequate facilities and improving those in need of renovation?
- Further, in preparing annual school budgets, could local school innovation be nurtured by providing individual schools with discretionary funds and giving recognition to those schools that make the most effective use of such funds?

Implications for Local Administrators

While it is easy to "pass the buck" to Raleigh and claim that it is state law and regulation that tie the hands of local school administrators, many of the policies that discourage building level innovation are local policies.

- Is the time ripe for local school administrators to reassess their own policies and see if educational "de-regulation" could begin at home?
- Further, in preparing annual school budgets, would it not be wise to propose meaningful discretionary funds that could be used to give teachers and principals the means to solve some of the problems confronting their buildings?
- Could school administrators provide in-service training to all school managers aimed at moving toward a more collegial style of school management?

Implications for Teachers

As a member of the North Carolina House of Representatives said at the Charlotte conference, "Accountability is the issue. If business people and legislators are convinced that results will come if we spend more on schools, than we'll commit more to schools." Accountability may well be the issue.

If education in North Carolina is to evolve to a truly collaborative venture that gives teachers and principals wide latitude at the building level, policy makers will undoubtedly be looking for results. That will require a major effort on the part of teachers to demonstrate the positive potential that is possible if schools are allowed to make decisions that would improve the work place.

- Could individual teachers and groups of teachers take the initiative to develop collaborative plans to improve the quality of education at individual schools?
- Could teachers, through their professional organizations, provide teachers with training on collaborative styles of school management?
- Could teachers work more closely with legislators, county commissioners and school board members to seek a consensus on meaningful changes to improve the schools?

Follow-Up

When introducing herself to the participants at the Greensboro Conference, a local school board member said, "I'm here to listen." And listen she did, as did the other 79 policy makers who attended one or more of the six conferences.

Some did more than listen. After the conferences ended, a number of legislators contacted participants and discussed issues in greater depth; others asked for specific recommendations they could take back to the General Assembly.

Equally encouraging, five counties have decided to replicate the "Talking With Educators" conferences locally. Burke County organized a session that brought together school employees, school board members and county commissioners. Goldsboro City, Durham City, Orange County and New Hanover County also have planned "Talking With Educator" conferences.

As for educators who participated in the conferences, an Asheville teacher summed things up well when she said, "Grumbling at the lunch table is merely masochistic. We are finally talking to the right people." Another teacher at the Asheville conference said, "From top to bottom, we have the same concerns."

The real question, of course, is what will happen to the recommendations that came out of the conferences? Follow-up intended to make the six conferences more than a healthy catharsis for educators wanting to influence the continuing debate on school improvement includes:

- Distributing of this document to all members of the General Assembly, the members of the State Board of Education, management staff at the State Department of Public Instruction, local school superintendents, participants who attended the conferences, representatives of the media, and the leadership of the School Boards Association, the NCAE, the Association of School Administrators, the PTA, the Association of County Commissioners, the Principals Executive Program, the Center for the Advancement of Teaching, and the Public School Forum;
- Providing assistance to counties wanting to replicate a "Talking With Educators" conference;
- Providing research on specific recommendations to legislators interested in advancing one or more of the recommendations;
- Encouraging representatives of the media to examine the recommendations publicly; and
- Initiating discussions regarding similar policy discussions between educators and policy makers to focus on other areas of school need.

Hopefully, participants at the conferences will encourage their professional associations and colleagues to examine these recommendations and attempt to incorporate them into plans for the coming year.

If anything is certain, it will take a concerted effort of policy makers and educators to make the school reform movement meaningful. As stated earlier, the recommendations being made are inter-related.

Providing greater latitude for decision making, without considering the time requirements and the need for additional support at the building level, is unlikely to produce positive results.

Providing more clerical assistance and continuing to conduct "business as usual" in every other aspect of school life does not address the real problem.

Under-estimating the need for decent, safe school facilities is self-defeating.

Each of the recommendations made is important; each relates to the other.

A Postscript

At the conclusion of the Greenville conference, one of the participants said, "Wouldn't it be great to design a school based on the priority recommendations that came out of our meeting?"

That remark led one of the conference planners to picture a scenario where a reporter in the Twenty-First Century interviews a school board member in a county that adopted the recommendations that came from the "Talking With Educators" conferences. The results of that fictional interview follow:

THE ACCOUNTABLE SCHOOL

The Year: 2014 A.D.

The Place: A small town in North Carolina

The People: A reporter is interviewing a citizen

Written by:

Dr. Bruce McPherson
Executive Director
N.C. Center for the
Advancement of Teaching

You've had a good deal of experience with the public schools here, haven't you?

I've spent all my life here, and I've raised my children here. By doing that, I've seen the schools from many angles—as a mother, as a PTA officer, as a school board member, and now as a county commissioner. I can tell you that I've been around long enough to see a lot of changes.

Would you tell me about the changes?

Of course. In the early 1980s, the schools in our community weren't much different from the ones I attended after World War II. They looked the same, and they were run the same. But they are really different today.

The most important thing is the way they are operated. Once upon a time, the superintendent ran the schools. Then, for a long time, the principals were in charge. But now, the teachers have a lot more to say about the organization and management of the schools.

Do you mean the teachers run the schools?

*No, I don't mean that. Let's say that the principal and teachers run the school **together**, but it took about 20 years of getting used to. Now, they make decisions*

together, where they used to have to wait for the principal to make decisions. You see this especially with respect to the budget. Now they have more flexibility to spend money at the school level. They can decide where and how to use it to meet student needs. The same goes for personnel decisions, too.

To tell you the truth, I think they are making smarter decisions than we used to when I was sitting on the school board, and we thought we had to control the budget and personnel line items. And what we didn't want to control, the folks in Raleigh did. We've all learned to trust educators in the schools a good deal more.

Yes, but who's accountable? Doesn't someone have to be the boss?

That's an old question. We answered it in the early 1990s by saying that the principal is in charge of the school and the teachers are in charge of the instructional program. That's when we started using the word "collegiality." It means that the professionals in a school have equal shares of authority and autonomy and responsibility. Teachers were turned from workers with a boss into colleagues. If you were in business, I guess you'd use the word "shareholder" or "stockholder."

Does that make them more accountable?

Of course it does. If you treat teachers like assembly line workers, how can you hold them accountable for the results of the schools. And that's what we were after on the school board: better schools, not just better classroom teachers. So, with the encouragement of the General Assembly, we were able to develop this sense of collegiality. We cut the teachers in, rather than continuing to cut them out. And, in the long run, I think the principal's job has become easier, more exciting, and much more satisfying.

Does the principal hold the teachers accountable for the performance of the students?

The real question is: How can we be accountable to teachers and principals in the schools? In other words, how do we help the teachers so they can become accountable. It seems logical now, but we couldn't see that for a long time in North Carolina, and in the whole country, actually.

Once we decided to listen and respond to what teachers were saying, we began to make real progress.

What exactly did you do?

First, we tried to improve the schedule. There was almost a celebration when every teacher in our schools had a duty-free lunch and a planning period. Then we got smaller class sizes and, just before the turn of the century, we adopted the 11-month school year and a longer school day. With that, teacher salaries went right on par with those of engineers.

We even made provisions for some teachers to have lighter daily and annual schedules, just like in the old days. Of course, they didn't get paid as much, and they had to work out their professional development on their own time. Not many opted for that, but it was right for some teachers.

The second step was improving the environment for teachers. We really improved our school buildings. Our schools aren't palaces today, but they are fit for our educators and our children, and we couldn't always say that.

The key wasn't brick and mortar, though. It had to do with providing paraprofessional support in three areas—teaching, clerical and duty assignments. You could really feel the difference in the schools when teachers had adequate help, especially with things that get in the way of teaching and learning. Paperwork is still a problem, and I suppose it always will be, but I think it's under better control.

We also solved the evaluation problem. Now, principals and lead teachers and classroom teachers are all involved in supervision in our schools. While evaluations are still judgmental, they also are supportive, diagnostic and flexible. With inside observers, mediocre teachers are harder and harder to find in our schools. After all, outstanding teachers want to work with other outstanding teachers.

You were contending with new technology in the schools then, too, weren't you?

Oh, yes. Computers and word processors in particular. There were two tricks we had to accomplish. The first was to make certain that the correct technology was available as new curriculum requirements were developed by the state, and to see that teachers were instructed appropriately in its use. The second was to assure that school offices were properly equipped to handle the new management and information systems required by the state. Principals and secretaries had to get used to a different way of doing business. And, in time, they did.

Going back to the issue of facilities, I'm surprised that there are still schools without air conditioning and where teachers don't have phones and offices.

Back in the 1980s, we heard a lot about these issues from teachers and principals. But as we began to give them more flexibility to deal with educational issues at the school level—fundamentally changing how they worked with each other—we found that these issues were really secondary concerns. That's not to say that they aren't important and that we aren't trying to accommodate this changes as new schools are built, but these issues took on less of a priority as teachers felt they were treated more professionally.

Let's go back to accountability again. What does that word mean to you now?

*In schools, I think it means responsibility for taking care of our children and being responsible for the **results** of their education. I've never believed that you could use tests to assess accountability. Accountability is more complex, more elusive than that.*

Here are my accountability questions: Are schools safe and supportive and exciting places for our children and their teachers and principals? Do our children graduate from high school? Do they continue in their education? Do they get jobs and lead productive and satisfying lives? I believe that educators have a share of the accountability in answering these questions.

We can answer these questions by looking at the dropout rate, which has declined steadily since 1992, and by starting a new statewide program to track high school students into the community for 10 years to see how they're doing. Then, we can figure out how to make our schools even better.

But doesn't accountability have to do with supervision and who pays the bills, like in a family?

The buck stops not with educators, but with the citizens. The truth of the matter is that if we organize our schools correctly, hire superior educators, and support and encourage them, our schools will work very well. Of course, the General Assembly still has a right to know that our tax dollars are being spent appropriately and wisely. It's up to the local districts to provide that information about the individual schools.



Sue Bechard, Education Commission of the States; Diane Price, Teacher Recruiter, Region 2; and Veronica Clay, Teacher, Person County Schools.

*Moving to fewer districts in this state has given us added **efficiency**, but you get **effectiveness** by giving some real power to local schools. In North Carolina, we've centralized and decentralized public education at the same time, and it's worked. As Winston Churchill said to the United States during the Second World War: "Give us the tools, and we will do the job." That's just what we've finally done here: given the educators in the schools—principals and teachers—what they need, and they're doing the job. And those of us who have been citizens here over the past 20 to 30 years have done our job, too. I think we held ourselves accountable, and our educators responded with accountability.*

When you come back around here in 20 to 30 years, you'll find some new changes, but probably not so much in our schools. The big problems are behind us now—the organization and relationship problems were holding us up. It's nice to have them under our belts. We did good work on them.

Appendix A

Following is a list of all the participants at the six "Talking With Educators" conferences.

LEGISLATORS

Meeting 1

The Honorable Bo Thomas
The Honorable Gordon Greenwood
The Honorable Martin Nesbitt
The Honorable Narvel Jim Crawford

Meeting 2

The Honorable John Brown
The Honorable Judy Hunt
The Honorable Howard Bryan
The Honorable Wade Wilmoth
The Honorable W. Stine Isenhower
The Honorable Lois Walker

Meeting 3

The Honorable Bob Shaw
The Honorable Charles Cromer
The Honorable Ann Duncan
The Honorable Tony Rand
The Honorable Russell Walker
The Honorable Robert Warren
The Honorable Al Lineberry, Sr.
The Honorable Theresa Esposito
The Honorable Richard Chalk
The Honorable Bill Goldston, Jr.
The Honorable Bill Martin
The Honorable Mary Seymour

Meeting 4

The Honorable Jo Graham Foster
The Honorable Howard Barnhill
The Honorable Bobby Barbee, Sr.
The Honorable John McLaughlin
The Honorable Harry Grimmer
The Honorable Charlotte Gardner
The Honorable Tony Rand
The Honorable David Bumgardner, Jr.

The Honorable Ruth Easterling
The Honorable Bob Etheridge
The Honorable Laurence A. Cobb
The Honorable Parks Helms
The Honorable Jim McDuffie
The Honorable Helen Marvin
The Honorable Jim Richardson

Meeting 5

The Honorable Ed Warren
The Honorable Howard Chapin
The Honorable R.M. Thompson, Sr.
The Honorable Bob Etheridge

Meeting 6

The Honorable Harry Payne, Jr.
The Honorable David Redwine
The Honorable Harold Hardison

SUPERINTENDENTS

Meeting 1

Supt. Charles McConnell
Supt. Eugene Yarbrough
Supt. Douglas Pearson

Meeting 2

Supt. Wayne Trogdon
Supt. Sam Houston, Jr.
Supt. James Wilson
Supt. Jim Simeon

Meeting 3

Supt. Willis McLeod
Supt. Howard Maniloff
Supt. Owen Phillips
Supt. Zane Eargle
Supt. Larry Coble

Meeting 4

Supt. Larry Ivey
Supt. Robert A. Nelson
Supt. Jerry Paschal
Asst. Supt. Hubert Gooch

Meeting 5

Supt. Clifton Toler
Supt. Jeanne Meiggs
Supt. John Dunn

Meeting 6

Supt. Richard Flynn
Supt. Young Allen
Supt. Earl Watson
Ms. Janet Furman

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

Meeting 3

Dr. Barbara Tapscott

Meeting 5

Mrs. Patricia Neal
Mr. W.C. Meekins, Jr.

N.C. SCHOOL BOARD ASSOCIATION/GUIDANCE COUNSELORS

Meeting 1

Mr. Culver Dale

Meeting 2

Ms. Janet Wilson
Ms. Shelby Shore

Meeting 3

Ms. Emily Redding
Ms. Betty Copeland
Ms. Janice Cone
Dr. Ted Parrish
Dr. Willa Bryant

Meeting 4

Ms. Jean Dellinger

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Meeting 1

Mr. Jack A. Wood

Meeting 2

Ms. Frances Murdock
Ms. Gretchen Peed

Meeting 3

Ms. Dorothy Kearns
Mr. Darrell Frye

Meeting 4

Mr. Jack Dossenbach, Jr.
Mrs. Virginia Oliver

Meeting 5

Mr. Bill Owens

Meeting 6

Mr. George Graham
Mr. Fred Retchin
Mr. Fletcher Pearson
Ms. Louise Muse

PRINCIPALS

Meeting 1

Mrs. M. Margaret Ingle
Mr. Malcolm Brown
Mr. Ed Graham
Mr. Otha L. Sherrill
Mr. Gene Young
Dr. Ellen Burgess
Mr. William Hughes
Mr. Joseph McMinn
Ms. Karen H. Campbell

Meeting 2

Mr. Vernon Thompson
Mr. Ted J. Watson
Mr. Boyd Barrier
Ms. Peggy Lowdermilk
Mr. Stephen Huffman
Ms. Susan Arrowood
Mr. Frank A. Harris

Meeting 3

Ms. Helen Collier
Dr. Penny Smith
Mr. Harold Estep
Ms. Diane Payne
Mrs. Annie Ray Riffey
Ms. Clara Crutchfield
Mrs. Teresa Abron
Dr. J. Franklin Miller
Mr. Frank Walker
Ms. Gladys S. Cartwright

Meeting 4

Mr. Malcolm Forde
Ms. Beatrice W. Colson
Mr. Ralph S. Robertson
Mr. Donald Bullock
Ms. Brenda Blalock
Mr. Steve Miller
Mr. Jerry Cross
Mr. Frank H. Richards

Meeting 5

Mr. William Roper
Mrs. Beth Ward
Mr. Landon R. Miales
Mr. Ernest Brooks
Mr. Alfred Lockamy
Mr. Rob Boyce
Ms. Ann Clontz
Ms. Georgetta Jackson
Ms. Rita B. Collie

Meeting 6

Mrs. Mildred Bryant
Ms. Shirley Carraway
Mr. Roosevelt Wright
Mr. Lenwood Padgett
Mr. Tommy Benson
Mr. Whit Whitaker
Ms. Dean Clark Smith
Ms. Susan Hill Rivenbark
Ms. Valeria Barrow

TEACHERS OF THE YEAR

Meeting 1

Mrs. June Barnwell
Ms. Amelia Fortner
Ms. Sue Carpenter
Ms. Beverly Lonon Foster
Ms. Ellen Burris
Ms. Carolyn R. Smith

Meeting 2

Ms. Ann Welldreier
Ms. Norma Palmer
Mrs. Sue Wilson Kirkman
Ms. Susan H. Gentry
Ms. Amy A. Campbell

Meeting 3

Ms. Rachel Conway
Ms. Jean Swainey
Ms. Nancy McNeil
Mr. Todd Harris

Meeting 4

Mrs. Patricia Alexander Washam
Mr. Hal E. Tyner
Mr. David Barlow
Mrs. Beth Galloway Clary
Ms. Elizabeth C. Smith
Mrs. Ada Ruth Andrews Evans
Mrs. Robbie Matthews
Ms. Barbara Morrison
Ms. Mary Anne E. Simon

Meeting 5

Mr. Danny Barnes
Ms. Geraldine Hill
Mrs. Patricia Mitchell Clark
Mrs. Lois Hollowell Chenault
Ms. Diane Minton

Meeting 6

Ms. Veronica Clay
Ms. Diane D. Price
Ms. Sandra Blake
Ms. Lyn Pitman
Ms. Marjorie Moore
Ms. Polly Whitehead
Ms. Loretta Lewis
Ms. Linda Patton

TEACHERS

Meeting 1

Ms. Karol Kay Trull
Ms. Hazel English
Ms. Brenda Mosteller
Ms. Polly Parker
Ms. Sandra Smiley
Ms. Charlene Hall
Ms. Patricia Keever
Ms. Linda Ferguson
Ms. Diana Brewton
Mr. Fred Byrd
Ms. Linda Iovacchini
Ms. Ann Melton
Ms. Mary Piercy
Ms. Beverly Russell
Ms. Doris Sgan
Ms. Robin Stanley
Ms. Janet Woy

Meeting 2

Ms. Susan Phipps
Mr. Johnny Gibson
Ms. Pam Brewer
Ms. Debra Beason
Ms. Nancy Bell
Ms. Beth Carrin
Ms. Bonnie Cook
Ms. Judith Miller
Ms. Brenda Eckard
Ms. Linda Whisnant
Mr. Larry Sloop
Mrs. Ann Simpson
Mr. Andy Simpson
Ms. Linda Piper
Ms. Barbara Moy
Ms. Carolyn Lithgo
Ms. Jewel Adams

Meeting 3

Ms. Cathy Keeter
Ms. Linda Hughes
Ms. Colleen Lanier
Ms. Cindy Echerd
Ms. Tanya Brumfield
Mr. Ren Bryan
Ms. Mary Claiborne
Ms. Mary Ella Cameron
Ms. Martha Davis
Ms. Mary Giemza
Ms. Treasure Jaynes

Ms. Irene Johnson
Ms. Nancy Motley
Ms. Elaine Percival
Ms. Sheria Reid
Ms. Sandra Rhodus
Ms. Lucille Slaughter
Ms. Barbara Giesler
Ms. Pam Brewer

Meeting 4

Mrs. Phyllis P. Carpenter
Ms. Laura Cable
Mr. Milton Little
Mr. Edward Milner
Ms. Mary Modlin
Mr. Donald Nance
Ms. Glenda Nance
Ms. Cynthia Roddey
Ms. Elizabeth Shaw
Ms. Jane Smith
Ms. Vicki Yurko
Ms. Karen Bates
Ms. Beth Blackwelder
Dean Calhoun
Mrs. Janice Crilly-Daniel
Ms. Carolyn Jordan
Ms. Olivia Keeth
Ms. Ann Little
Ms. Barbara Giesler
Ms. Pam Brewer

Meeting 5

Mr. Braxton Hall
Ms. Audrey Bell
Ms. Peggy Bowen
Ms. Judith Boyer
Mr. Julian Cleveland
Ms. Trudy Cloyd
Ms. Sadie Fowle
Ms. Mary Keeter
Ms. Thelma Speight
Ms. Elouise White
Ms. Billie Lennon
Ms. Barbara Hodges
Ms. Pam McIntyre
Ms. Carolyn Moore
Ms. Beverly Peaden
Ms. Shelby Strother
Mr. Delano Wilson
Ms. Nancy Wynne
Ms. Pam Brewer
Ms. Bet Archie
Ms. Carol Culver

Meeting 6

Ms. Pearlene Faison
Ms. Joan George
Mr. Alex Leary
Ms. Jane Munson
Ms. Debra Outlaw
Ms. Mona Quick
Ms. Elizabeth Roberson
Ms. Elizabeth Waters
Ms. Sara Cartrette
Ms. Janet Flanagan
Ms. Alice Garrett
Ms. Linda Highsmith
Mr. Paul Lucas
Ms. Shirley K. Smith
Ms. Lillie Stokes
Mr. Glenn Tetterton-Opheim
Ms. Pam Brewer

OBSERVERS

Meeting 3

Mr. Kim Underwood

Meeting 5

Dr. Don Ensley

Meeting 6

Mr. Jim Johnson
Mr. Tom Covington

DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL

Meeting 2

Ms. Joyce Spencer

STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION OFFICIALS

Ms. Ann Hocutt
Ms. Bobbye Draughon

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

Ms. Sue Bechard
Ms. Laura Feld

OTHERS

Mrs. Ruth Allen

Appendix B

While there was a remarkable similarity in the outcome of the six deliberations, participants at each conference focused on unique concerns and ranked major concerns somewhat differently. The following tables show the final results from each of the conferences:

ASHEVILLE

Traditional Issues

Emergent Issues

Response	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
RED	5	0	0	2	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	0	0	4	5	0
BLUE	5	0	0	4	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	2	5	4	0
ORANGE	5	0	0	3	1	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	3	1	0	5	0	0	0	4	2	-
GREEN	5	1	0	2	4	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	5	4	0
AVG.	5	0.2	0	2.7	2.7	0.5	0.2	3	0.5	0	0.2	0	0.7	1.7	0	3.2	0.2	0	0.5	4.5	3.7	0
HIGH	5	1	0	4	4	2	1	4	2	0	1	0	3	3	0	5	1	0	2	5	5	0
LOW	5	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	4	2	0
STD.	0	0.4	0	0.8	1.0	0.8	0.4	1.2	0.8	0	0.4	0	1.2	0.8	0	1.0	0.4	0	0.8	0.5	1.0	0

Traditional Issues

Rankings	Item	Score	
1	1	5.0	Smaller class size
2	7	3.0	Professional supervision and evaluation of classroom teachers
3	4	2.7	More clerical assistance for teachers
4	8	0.5	Improve general building facilities at local level
5	5	0.5	Fewer non-instructional duties
6	6	0.2	Less paperwork
7	2	0.2	Improve local staff development program
8	3	0.0	More equipment for faculty use
9	9	0.0	More teaching assistants
10	10	0.0	Development of parental involvement and support

Emergent Issues

Rankings	Item	Score	
1	3	7.0	Planning period for every teacher
2	10	4.5	More decision-making and control for teachers/principals at building level
3	11	3.7	Flexible scheduling and planning time with pay
4	6	3.2	More budget decision-making opportunities at school level
5	4	1.7	Differentiate roles for teachers
6	9	0.5	Technical management/information systems for local schools
7	7	0.2	Improve collegiality among teachers/administrators to facilitate collaborative efforts
8	1	0.2	Office space for teachers
9	5	0.0	Telephone for private use of teachers/staff
10	8	0.0	Clarify accountability of teachers/administrators
11	2	0.0	More training for teachers in use of technology
12	12	0.0	School-based interdisciplinary curriculum specialists

BOONE

Traditional Issues

Emergent Issues

Response	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
RED	7	0	4	5	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	2	3	1	4	5	0	0	7	0	6	0
BLUE	6	2	1	5	7	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	5	7	1	2	6	0	0	0
ORANGE	5	2	0	3	6	0	0	7	1	0	4	0	0	3	2	0	6	4	0	0	7	1	5	0
GREEN	3	0	0	4	5	0	0	2	1	7	6	0	0	3	2	0	6	5	1	0	7	0	4	0
AVG.	5.3	1.0	1.3	4.3	6.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	1.8	2.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.5	0.3	5.3	5.3	0.5	0.5	6.8	0.3	3.8	0.0
HIGH	7.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	3.0	7.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	3.0	1.0	6.0	7.0	1.0	2.0	7.0	1.0	6.0	0.0
LOW	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
STD.	1.5	1.0	1.6	0.8	0.7	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.8	2.9	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.8	1.1	0.5	0.9	0.4	0.4	2.3	0.0

Traditional Issues

Rankings	Item	Score	
1	5	6.0	Fewer non-instructional duties
2	1	5.3	Smaller class size
3	4	4.3	More clerical assistance for teachers
4	11	3.3	More support personnel
5	8	3.3	Improve general building facilities at local level
6	10	2.0	Differentiate process for teacher evaluation (flexible process/instrument)
7	9	1.8	More efforts to improve PR and involve business and community in schools
8	3	1.3	More equipment for faculty use
9	2	1.0	Improve local staff development programs
10	6	0.0	Less paperwork
11	7	0.0	Professional supervision and evaluation of classroom teachers

Emergent Issues

Rankings	Item	Score	
1	10	6.8	More decision-making and control for teachers/principals at building level
2	7	5.3	Improve collegiality among teachers/administrators to facilitate collaborative efforts
3	6	5.3	More budget decision-making opportunities at school level
4	12	3.8	More flexibility in managing resources at local level (i.e., teacher assignments, certification requirements, class size)
5	3	3.0	Planning period for every teacher
6	4	2.5	Differentiate roles for teachers
7	8	0.5	Clarify accountability of teachers/administrators
8	9	0.5	Technical management/information systems for schools
9	11	0.3	A 12-month school year for educators
10	5	0.3	Telephone for private use of teachers/staff
11	2	0.0	More training for teachers in use of technology
12	1	0.0	Office space for teachers
13	13	0.0	Adequate time to implement decisions of governing body

GREENSBORO

Traditional Issues

Emergent Issues

Response	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
RED	6	3	0	4	2	1	0	7	0	0	5	0	0	1	3	2	0	6	0	5	0	7	4	0
BLUE	2	7	0	5	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	5	0	0	3	2	6	1	0	0
ORANGE	6	0	0	5	4	0	2	7	0	0	1	3	0	0	5	2	0	6	3	4	1	7	0	0
GREEN	6	0	0	5	0	2	1	7	0	3	4	0	0	0	5	3	0	6	4	2	0	7	1	0
AVG.	5.0	2.5	0.0	4.8	2.3	0.8	2.3	5.3	0.0	0.8	2.5	1.8	0.0	0.3	3.3	3.0	0.0	4.5	2.5	3.3	1.8	5.5	1.3	0.0
HIGH	6.0	7.0	0.0	5.0	4.0	2.0	6.0	7.0	0.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	0.0	1.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	6.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	4.0	0.0
LOW	2.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
STD.	1.7	2.9	0.0	0.4	1.5	0.8	2.3	3.0	0.0	1.3	2.1	1.8	0.0	0.4	2.0	1.2	0.0	2.6	1.5	1.3	2.5	2.6	1.6	0.0

Traditional Issues

Rankings	Item	Score	
1	8	5.2	Improve general building facilities at the local level
2	1	5.0	Smaller class size
3	4	4.7	More clerical assistance for teachers
4	11	2.5	More availability of technology and time for teachers to use it
5	2	2.5	Improve local staff development programs
6	7	2.2	Professional supervision and evaluation of classroom teachers
7	5	2.2	Fewer non-instructional duties
8	12	1.7	Reduce and control fragmentation of day
9	10	0.7	Increase professional development funds for travel, etc.
10	6	0.7	Less paperwork
11	3	0.0	More equipment for faculty use
12	9	0.0	Eliminate combination classes

Emergent Issues

Rankings	Item	Score	
1	10	5.5	More decision-making and control for teachers/principals at building level
2	6	4.5	More budget decision-making opportunities at the school level
3	8	3.2	Clarify accountability of teachers/administrators
4	3	3.2	Planning period for every teacher
5	4	3.0	Differentiate roles for teachers
6	7	2.5	Improve collegiality among teachers/administrators to facilitate collaborative efforts
7	9	1.7	Technical management/information systems for schools
8	14	1.7	Internal and external marketing of teaching profession
9	11	1.2	Support 11 months of employment for teachers
10	13	1.0	Restructure the class day
11	2	0.2	More training for teachers in use of technology
12	12	0.0	Find balance between affective, social and academic responsibility
13	1	0.0	Office space for teachers
14	5	0.0	Telephone for private use of teachers/staff

CHARLOTTE

Traditional Issues

Emergent Issues

Response	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
RED	7	0	0	6	5	0	0	3	0	2	4	1	0	0	6	3	0	5	2	4	0	7	0	0	1	0
BLUE	7	0	0	0	4	1	2	5	0	3	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	6	3	4	0	7	0	0	2	1
ORANGE	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	6	5	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	1	5	2	7	0	0	6	0
GREEN	7	0	0	0	3	0	2	4	0	1	6	5	0	0	6	1	0	4	0	0	2	7	0	0	3	5
AVG.	7.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	3.3	0.8	1.0	3.8	1.5	2.8	5.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	5.0	1.0	0.0	4.8	1.5	3.3	1.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	1.5
HIGH	7.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	3.0	0.0	6.0	3.0	5.0	2.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	5.0
LOW	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
STD.	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	1.5	0.8	1.0	0.8	2.6	1.5	1.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.8	1.1	1.9	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	2.1

Traditional Issues

Rankings	Item
1	1 Smaller class size
2	11 Eliminate combination classes
3	8 Improve general building facilities at local level
4	5 Fewer non-instructional duties
5	10 Sabbatical leave with scholarship; extra pay for extra duties; duty-free lunch
6	4 More clerical assistance for teachers
7	9 Increased professional development funds for local school staff
8	12 Streamline exceptional children programs paperwork
9	7 Professional supervision and evaluation of teachers
10	6 Less paperwork
11	3 More equipment for faculty use
12	2 Improve local staff development programs

Emergent Issues

Rankings	Item
1	10 Provide more decision-making and control for teachers/principals
2	3 Planning period for every teacher
3	6 More budget decision-making opportunities at school level
4	8 Clarify accountability of teachers/administrators
5	13 Resolve conflict between expanded local school curriculum and resources
6	14 Alternative measures for dealing with discipline problems and changing family structure
7	7 Improve collegiality among teachers/administrators
8	4 Differentiate roles for teachers
9	9 Technical management and information systems for local schools (with training, maintenance and staffing for operations)
10	2 More training for teachers in use of technology
11	11 Extend instructional day to 6-6½ hours to meet extracurricular demands
12	12 Re-evaluation of teacher assistant job description (potential use school-wide clerical and monitoring duty)
13	5 Telephone for private use of teachers and staff
14	1 Office space for teachers

GREENVILLE

Traditional Issues

Emergent Issues

Response	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
RED	4	2	0	7	6	5	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	3	0	1	6	5	7	0
BLUE	7	0	1	6	3	0	5	4	2	0	0	2	0	0	3	7	4	0	6	1	5	0
ORANGE	6	2	3	4	5	0	1	7	0	0	0	3	2	0	5	6	1	4	7	0	0	0
GREEN	7	4	0	4	2	0	5	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	2	5	0	7	0	3	4
AVG.	6.0	2.0	1.0	5.3	4.0	1.3	3.0	5.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.5	0.0	4.5	4.5	2.5	1.3	6.5	1.5	3.8	1.0
HIGH	7.0	4.0	3.0	7.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	6.0	7.0	5.0	4.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	4.0
LOW	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
STD.	1.2	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.6	2.2	2.0	1.6	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.9	0.0	1.1	2.1	2.1	1.6	0.5	2.1	2.6	1.7

Traditional Issues

Rankings	Item
1	1 Smaller class size
2	4 More clerical assistance for teachers
3	8 Improve general building facilities at local level
4	5 Fewer non-instructional duties
5	7 Professional supervision and evaluation of teachers that are both supportive and evaluative
6	2 Supplement and improve building-level staff development programs, especially goal-oriented initiatives
7	6 Less paperwork
8	3 More equipment for faculty use
9	9 Increase positive parental support for schools, especially at junior and senior high school level

Emergent Issues

Rankings	Item
1	10 Provide more real control to teachers/principals through joint decision-making that leads to action
2	7 Improve collegiality among teachers/administrators in order to facilitate collaborative efforts
3	6 More budget decision-making opportunities at school level
4	12 Create paraprofessional position to aid teachers that will result in less paperwork and fewer non-instructional responsibilities (clerical and duty assistance)
5	8 Clarify accountability of teachers and administrators
6	3 Guaranteed planning period for every teacher
7	11 Prepare educators to be more assertive in professional relationships and decision-making
8	9 Technical management and information systems for local schools
9	13 Test scores should not be used to reflect performance of teachers/administrators
10	4 Differentiate roles for teachers
11	2 More training for teachers in use of technology
12	5 Telephone for private use of teachers/staff
13	1 Office space for teachers

WILMINGTON

Traditional Issues

Emergent Issues

Response	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
RED	6	0	2	7	0	3	4	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	0	5	6	0
BLUE	4	5	0	7	0	0	6	3	0	1	0	2	0	6	2	3	0	0	0	4	5	7	1	0	0	0
ORANGE	6	2	0	7	0	3	4	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	4	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	6	3
GREEN	6	4	0	7	0	0	2	5	0	1	0	3	0	4	5	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	3	0	0
AVG.	5.5	2.8	0.5	7.0	0.0	1.5	4.0	4.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.8	0.0	3.3	4.0	2.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	3.0	7.0	0.3	2.0	3.0	0.8
HIGH	6.0	5.0	2.0	7.0	0.0	3.0	6.0	5.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	7.0	1.0	5.0	6.0	3.0
LOW	4.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
STD.	0.9	1.9	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.4	0.9	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.9	1.2	2.5	1.6	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.2	0.0	0.4	2.1	3.0	1.3

Traditional Issues

Rankings	Item	Score	
1	4	7.0	More clerical assistance for teachers, possibly by creating a paraprofessional position assigned to assist with instruction and non-instructional duties
2	1	5.5	Smaller class size and lower ratios
3	8	4.5	Improve general building facilities at local level
4	7	4.0	Appropriate supervision and evaluation of all professional educators
5	2	2.8	Improve local staff development programs
6	12	1.8	Reduction of test-driven effects in school
7	6	1.5	Streamline and reduce paperwork and documentation
8	10	0.5	Duty-free lunch period to be used at teacher discretion
9	3	0.5	More equipment for faculty use
10	9	0.0	Required curriculum should be less segmented
11	11	0.0	Address how discipline and other related problems are administered
12	5	0.0	Fewer non-instructional duties

Emergent Issues

Rankings	Item	Score	
1	10	7.0	Provide more decision-making and control for teachers/principals at building level
2	3	4.0	Planning period for every teacher
3	2	3.3	More training for teachers, especially in techniques and technologies required for implementation of new curriculum areas
4	13	3.0	Professional and paraprofessional personnel decision-making should be done through a collaborative effort between teachers/administrators at school level
5	9	3.0	Technical management and information systems for local schools
6	4	2.3	Differentiate roles for teachers
7	12	2.0	Clarification of middle school philosophy, regulations and standards at state and local levels with appropriate support and resources
8	8	1.3	Clarify and streamline accountability of teachers/administrators
9	5	1.3	Telephone for private use of teachers/staff
10	14	0.8	Rethink individual school sizes in order to restore interpersonal relationships and community/family participation
11	11	0.3	More collegial process for the selection of principals and assistant principals
12	6	0.0	More budget decision-making opportunities at school level
13	1	0.0	Office space for teachers
14	7	0.0	Improve collegiality among teachers/administrators in order to facilitate collaborative efforts

Appendix C

The Conference Agenda

Talking With Educators

Day One

3:00-5:00 *Check in*

5:00-5:30 *Conference Registration*

5:30-6:30 *Reception*

All participants will have received advance copies of the "Conditions" Study and will have been asked to discuss the findings with their colleagues; participants are encouraged to discuss reactions with others at the reception.

6:30-7:45 *Dinner*

See name tags for table assignment; each table will have a mix of teachers, principals, superintendents and legislators.

7:45-9:00 *Opening Session*

Welcoming Remarks

Pam Brewer, 1985-86 Teacher of the Year
or, Cynthia Zeger, 1987-88 Teacher of the Year

Introductions

Goals of the Conference

John Dornan, Public School Forum

Conference Format

Bruce McPherson, Center for the Advancement of Teaching

Day Two

7:30-8:30 *Buffet Breakfast*

8:30-10:25 *Table Discussion One: Expectations for the Day*

Participants will be in mixed groups (i.e. teachers, principals and superintendents; note name tags for table assignments).

10:25-10:35 *The First "Straw Poll" on Priorities*

10:35-11:00 *Coffee Break*

11:00-12:20 *Table Discussion Two*

Participants will re-focus on environmental priorities in "role" groups; teachers will be grouped with teachers, principals with principals, and superintendents with superintendents.

12:20-12:30 *The Second "Straw Poll" on Priorities*

12:30-1:30 *Lunch*

1:30-2:50 *Table Discussion Three*

Participants will rejoin the original mixed groups and focus again on priorities drawing on the views of the mixed groups.

2:50-3:00 *The Final "Straw Poll"*

3:00-3:30 *Coffee Break*

During the break, policy makers are expected to join the conference to hear the outcome of the day's discussion.

3:30-3:45 *An Overview of the Deliberations & the Findings*

John Dornan, Public School Forum and/or
Bruce McPherson, Center for the Advancement of Teaching

3:45-4:30 *Policy Makers & Educators Discuss the Priorities*

4:30-4:45 *A Panel of Policy Makers React*

4:45-5:00 *Conference Wrap Up & Challenge*

REGION 1
November 16-17, 1987
Hilton, Greenville

REGION 2
December 1-2, 1987
Blockade Runner,
Wrightsville Beach

REGIONS 3 & 5
November 5-6, 1987
Marriott, Greensboro

REGIONS 4 & 6
November 11-12, 1987
Adams Mark, Charlotte

REGION 7
October 29-30, 1987
Holiday Inn, Boone

REGION 8
October 19-20, 1987
Holiday Inn, West, Asheville

Appendix D

The conferences would not have been possible without the assistance of table facilitators and recorders nominated and trained by the North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching (NCCAT).

The names and school systems of these individuals appear below.

On behalf of the conference planners and participants, a special note of thanks is extended to each of the school systems that made it possible for these teachers to play a valuable part in the conference series.

FACILITATORS

Meeting 1

Ms. Rebecca Spell
Mr. Mike Lodico
Ms. Donna James
Ms. Wanda Caldwell
Ms. Burr Bost

Meeting 2

Ms. Burr Bost
Ms. Wanda Caldwell
Ms. Donna James
Mr. Michael Lodico

Meeting 3

Mr. Brian Tarr
Ms. Anne Hice
Ms. Everlena Diggs
Ms. Dixie Dellinger

Meeting 4

Mr. Brian Tarr
Ms. Anne Hice
Ms. Everlena Diggs
Ms. Dixie Dellinger

Meeting 5

Ms. Rebecca Spell
Ms. Kathleen Sabella
Ms. Polly Orr
Ms. Michele Call

Meeting 6

Ms. Kathleen Sabella
Ms. Polly Orr
Ms. Michele Call
Ms. Rebecca Spell

RECORDERS

Meeting 1

Mr. O.L. Yates
Mr. Mike McSwain
Ms. Louise Burrell
Ms. Rita Brown

Meeting 2

Mr. O.L. Yates
Mr. Michael McSwain
Ms. Rita Brown
Ms. Louise Burrell

Meeting 3

Ms. Sherry Salyer
Mr. Michael Hickman
Ms. Dot Bratton
Ms. Jean Bernholz

Meeting 4

Ms. Sherry Salyer
Mr. Michael Hickman
Ms. Dot Bratton

Meeting 5

Ms. Linda Wilber
Ms. Pantice Smith
Ms. Lucille Gilchrist
Mr. Jerry Covil

Meeting 6

Ms. Linda Wilber
Ms. Pantice Smith
Ms. Lucille Gilchrist
Mr. Jerry Covil

North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Training

The North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching (NCCAT) was created to recognize and support outstanding North Carolina teachers and to enhance teaching as an art and as a profession.

At the Center, exemplary teachers study advanced topics in the sciences, arts and humanities in a setting removed from the hectic pace of everyday life. They learn from and are stimulated intellectually by fellow teachers, preeminent university professors, nationally recognized scholars, statesmen, scientists, business leaders, journalists, and citizens from all walks of life.

A unit of The University of North Carolina system with its own board of trustees, NCCAT is a statewide facility located in Cullowhee on the campus of Western Carolina University.

Director

Dr. R. Bruce McPherson

Fellows

Dr. Walter P. Oldendorf

Dr. Jon A. Rinnander

Dr. Anthony G. Rud

Trustees

Dr. J. Carlyle Sitterson, Chairman

John A. Tate Jr., Vice Chairman

William Baggett, Greenville

Josephine Clement, Durham

Jerry L. Cole, Asheville

George Collins, North Wilkesboro

Dr. Myron L. Coulter, Cullowhee

Dr. Hubert A. Eaton Sr.,

Wilmington

Sarah E. Himan, Swannanoa

Dr. Pamela Mayer, Cary

Charles C. McConnell Jr.,

Waynesville

Dr. A. Craig Phillips, Raleigh

Dr. H.F. Robinson, Cullowhee

C. Dixon Spangler Jr., Chapel Hill

Elise Wilson, Fayetteville

The Public School Forum

The Public School Forum of North Carolina was founded in February of 1986 on the premise that a permanent partnership of business, educational and political leaders could make the public schools of North Carolina second to none. Since then, the Forum's goals have been to:

- Foster collaboration between business and education in the state;
- Provide results-oriented research and policy alternatives on matters of long-range educational consequence; and
- Work for broad-based consensus on policy initiatives aimed at improving public schools in North Carolina.

Based in Raleigh, the Forum is an expression of the belief that, by working together, key leaders in business, education and politics can find practical, workable solutions to the challenges facing all of North Carolina today.

OFFICERS

Mr. Gerry Hancock
Chairman

Mr. John N. Dornan
President & Executive Director

Dr. Pamela Mayer
Secretary

Mr. Richard Daugherty
Treasurer

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mr. C. Ronald Aycock
Executive Director
N.C. Association of County Commissioners

Mr. James O. Barber
Controller
N.C. State Board of Education

Rep. Daniel T. Blue
N.C. General Assembly

Mr. Gene Causby*
Executive Director
N.C. School Boards Association

Rep. Betsy Cochrane
N.C. General Assembly

Ms. Jeanette Council
Supervisor
Cumberland County Schools

Mr. Richard L. Daugherty*
General Manager
IBM Corporation

Mr. John N. Dornan*
Executive Director
Public School Forum of North Carolina

Dr. Zane E. Eargle
Superintendent
Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools

Dr. Donald E. Ensley
Associate Professor—
Community Health
East Carolina University

Rep. Bobby R. Etheridge
N.C. General Assembly

Mr. Malcolm Forde
President
N.C. Association of School Administrators

Dr. William C. Friday
President Emeritus
University of North Carolina

Sen. William D. Goldston
N.C. General Assembly

Ms. Ricki Grantmyre
President
N.C. PTA

Dr. Gladys Graves*
President
N.C. Association of Educators

Mr. Thomas W. Graves
President
N.C. Citizens for Business and Industry

Mr. Thomas B. Gray
President
N.C. Association of County Commissioners

Mr. William H. Grigg
Executive Vice President
Duke Power Company

Mr. Gerry Hancock*
Partner
Everett & Hancock

Mr. John T. Henley
President
N.C. Association of Independent Colleges and Universities

Mr. Tom Husted
Executive Director
N.C. Association of Educators

Mr. L. Vincent Lowe
President
Branch Banking & Trust Co.

Dr. John Lucas
Former President
Shaw University

Sen. William N. Martin
N.C. General Assembly

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

(Continued)

Dr. Pamela Mayer*

Associate Superintendent
Wake County Public Schools

Dr. Lee Monroe

Senior Education Advisor to the
Governor

Ms. Mary Morgan

N.C. State Board of Educators

Ms. Donna H. Oliver

National Teacher of the Year

Ms. Diane Payne

Principal
Enloe High School

Dr. A. Craig Phillips

State Superintendent
N.C. Department of Public
Instruction

Sen. Anthony E. Rand*

N.C. General Assembly

Dr. J.M. Robinson*

Vice President
University of North Carolina

Mr. Raymond Sarbaugh*

Executive Director
N.C. Association of School
Administrators

Gov. Robert Scott

President
N.C. Department of Community
Colleges

Ms. Patricia J. Shore

Director of Government
Relations—North Carolina
R.J. Reynolds Tobacco, USA

Mrs. Shelby Shore

President
N.C. School Boards Association

Mr. Sherwood Smith*

Chairman and President
Carolina Power & Light Co.

Mr. William D. Snider

Retired Editor
Greensboro Daily News

Sen. Marvin Ward

N.C. General Assembly

Rep. Edward N. Warren

N.C. General Assembly

Dr. Joyce Wasdell

Education Advisor to the
Governor

Rep. William T. Watkins*

N.C. General Assembly

Mrs. Janet Wilson

Past President
N.C. School Boards Association

Ms. Cynthia Zeger

N.C. Teacher of the Year

**Indicates a member of the
Forum's Executive Committee*

Additional copies of this report
may be purchased by sending a
check for \$5 each (\$4 for orders of
10 or more) to:

Public School Forum
117 Glenwood Avenue
Raleigh, NC 27603

the FORUM

Sponsoring Organizations

North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching

The Public School Forum of North Carolina

The Education Commission of the States

The sponsoring organizations want to extend a special note of thanks to the following organizations that cooperated in the planning of the conference series and/or nominated participants to attend the conferences:

The Principals' Executive Program

The North Carolina Association of Educators

The North Carolina Association of School Administrators

The North Carolina School Boards Association

The North Carolina Association of County Commissioners